

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Docket No. 7081

Investigation into Least-Cost Integrated Resource)
Planning for Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.'s)
Transmission System)

Order entered: 9/19/2006

ORDER RE SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The Public Service Board ("Board") had previously established deadlines of September 6, 2006, for the parties to file a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") in this proceeding, and September 11, 2006, for the parties to file comments on how the Board should proceed in its review of the MOU, including proposed schedules.

On September 6, 2006, the Vermont Department of Public Service ("Department") filed an MOU among many, but not all, of the parties to this proceeding. On September 11, 2006, the Department filed a proposed schedule for review of the MOU. In its September 11 filing, the Department states its understanding that the following parties have agreed to the proposed schedule: the Conservation Law Foundation; Central Vermont Public Service Corporation; the City of Burlington Electric Department; Green Mountain Power Corporation; Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.; Vermont Transco, LLC; Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Washington Electric Cooperative, Inc.; and the fourteen Municipals. No other party filed a proposed schedule.

The Board has reviewed the parties' proposed schedule, and adopts that schedule with two modifications, as follows:

October 12, 2006	Prefiled direct testimony filed by all parties who intend to submit testimony, either in support of the MOU filed on September 6, 2006, or in opposition thereto (either in whole or in part)
November 3, 2006	Prefiled rebuttal testimony filed by all parties who filed direct testimony; prefiled rebuttal testimony is also allowed by parties who did not file direct testimony to respond to issues presented in

another party's direct testimony that could not reasonably have been anticipated¹

November 28 Technical Hearings²
and 29, 2006

Parties to cooperate on informal discovery. If a party seeks formal discovery, the parties are to discuss the necessity and a schedule for it in good faith. Parties reserve the right to seek a formal discovery opportunity from the Board. The schedule may require alteration if formal discovery is agreed upon or ordered by the Board.

Finally, please be advised that the Board anticipates providing the parties with a list of questions and issues that it wishes the parties to address in their prefiled direct testimony.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Montpelier, Vermont, this 19th day of September, 2006.

<u>s/James Volz</u>)	
)	PUBLIC SERVICE
)	
<u>s/David C. Coen</u>)	BOARD
)	
)	OF VERMONT
<u>s/John D. Burke</u>)	

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

FILED: September 19, 2006

ATTEST: s/Susan M. Hudson
Clerk of the Board

NOTICE TO READERS: This decision is subject to revision of technical errors. Readers are requested to notify the Clerk of the Board (by e-mail, telephone, or in writing) of any apparent errors, in order that any necessary corrections may be made. (E-mail address: psb.clerk@state.vt.us)

1. This allowance for rebuttal by parties who did not prefile direct testimony is a modification to the parties' proposed schedule. This allowance represents a narrow exception to the requirement that only parties who filed direct testimony may file rebuttal.

2. These hearing dates are a modification to the parties' proposed schedule. The Board was not available on the parties' proposed hearing dates.